Comment on the Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement

	I agree with the following statements which I have checked:
1	The No Action Alternatives are not reasonable. The EIS should have a reasonable no action alternative.
2	The EIS is inadequate because it uses outdated 1990 census data rather than current population data for Nevada.
3	The analysis of transportation impacts in Nevada is insufficient for making modal, corridor and route decisions.
4	The floodplain analysis is insufficient for corridor and route selection
5	The impact of stigma on tourism, recreation and agriculture based economies in Nevada should be analyzed.
6	The EIS should analyze the impacts of a crash between a military airplane and a nuclear waste rail car.
	Other

Comments:

The Department of Energy's Yucca Mountain Draft Environmental Impact Statement includes an option to construct a rail line from Beowawe to Yucca Mountain through Crescent Valley to transport nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain. DOE is required to consider all comments submitted regarding the impacts of building and operating a repository including transportation. My comments for the record are:

What can I say to a government that made the worst choices prosible as far as their consist wants are concerned.

A government that cheeses nature over solar has an consideration for anyones safty, not even their own. How many bands with a 5 year life uponting containing nuclear resider with half-life expected by 1000 to 50,000 from have been surround in order decens, or in mine shafts with they started having earthquaked in the area of the mine shafts?

How can of expect my apinton to change such mass stepicity? My objection is primarly because of the legate of tracks along sixers and accident such as occurred at Beores when a can left the track, I have been estimates up to 5 miles, and it wount want in the track, I have been estimates up to 5 miles, and it wount want was wrong. What if it had been looded with newed worte?

